

DISTRICT SCHOOL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

VOL. XII.]

ALBANY, JUNE, 1851.

[NO. II.

The District School Journal of Education,
will be published monthly, at the city of Albany, and at Clinton Hall, No. 131 Nassau st., New-York.

TERMS: FIFTY CENTS PER ANNUM, payable in advance.
All communications should be addressed to S. S. RANDALL, Albany, N. Y.

The School Question.

Substance of Mr. RAYMOND'S Remarks in Committee of the Whole, March 6, 1851, on the several bills providing for the Establishment and Support of Common Schools throughout the State.

ASSEMBLY—March 6.

The question pending being upon the motion to strike out the first clause of the bill reported by the majority of the Committee on Colleges, Academies and Common Schools, declaring that "the Common Schools of this State shall hereafter be *Free* to all children between the ages of five and twenty-one."

Mr. Speaker Raymond addressed the committee substantially as follows :

It would be difficult, Mr. Chairman, to exaggerate the importance of the bills which await the action of this committee. Different as are their details, they all seek one object. Various as are the opinions which prevail among the members of this House upon this subject, we all are aiming at the same result. We seek, and all these bills seek, to devise some system of STATE EDUCATION which shall be better than any of which the State has yet had experience.

The necessity of thus providing an improved system of Education for our great State will scarcely be contested. The utility of Education is universally conceded. Its utility to the individual, as fitting him to discharge the duties which he owes to others, to perform the part providentially assigned to him in human affairs, to attain that perfect stature of intellectual and moral endowment for which he was designed: its utility to Society, as infusing into its elements of virtue, energy and advancement: its utility to the State, as laying the only firm foundations on which it can stand, is too thoroughly and too generally understood, to render proper, or even excusable,

any argument in demonstration of it in this presence and at this time. Especially is Education known and felt to be essential to the success of a Republican government, the very first requirement of which is that every citizen shall be a ruler,—that every inhabitant shall discharge to some extent and within his sphere, the great duty of making laws for all who are embraced within the limits of the commonwealth of which he forms a part. No man can do this aright, unless he be educated,—unless his faculties have been cultivated,—his mind disciplined, and his whole character shaped and moulded by such appliances as true Education can alone confer. This consideration alone would show the necessity of providing, for every citizen of a republican State, such an education as should fit him to discharge aright the responsible duties which the fact of citizenship implies.

But there are considerations connected with the character and current history of this State, which render it peculiarly important that our State system of Education should be improved from year to year. In the first place, the natural increase of our own population renders necessary the constant enlargement of our means of mental and moral instruction.—And in the next place, the constant flood of emigration which pours, yearly and hourly, upon our shores,—an emigration involving an accession to our population of three or four hundred thousand persons every year, and that too, of that class which most imperatively requires instruction in the very elements of republicanism and of society,—renders doubly necessary this progressive improvement of our educational system. Of these foreigners, it must be remembered, annually landed on our shores, that class which is best instructed, which has the most accurate knowledge of our country and of the economy of life, passes through our State and takes up its abode in the rich valleys of the fertile West. Those among them who have the means wherewith to do so, and who are sufficiently instructed to foresee the advantages which such a step will involve, go to the West, purchase farms there and grow up to comfort and affluence, as the

country grows up to wealth and power. Those, on the contrary, who have left their own homes from no such foresight and with no such views of future independence, but who have fled under the impulse of sharp oppression, who have left their native land, because it had become to them a scourge and a curse,—whose scanty means were exhausted in the effort and who have found themselves, therefore, cast upon our shores penniless and friendless,—this is the class that must remain inhabitants of our State, and soon assume the duties and responsibilities which citizenship involves. These men are to take part in the government of our country. Their children are to share with ours the arduous and responsible task of protecting the rights, guiding the energies and building up the interests of this great State. For them, therefore, and for their interests,—for their own prosperity and for the welfare of the State whose interests are to be entrusted to their keeping, must our State system of Education be enlarged and improved. For them and for their children must our Common Schools be rendered more and more accessible. For them and theirs must our educational system keep pace with the increasing necessities of revolving years.

The progress of the times, moreover, requires that our schools should from year to year be made more and more efficient. There is beyond all doubt, much clamorous and absurd boasting about the progress of the age and its superiority over all the times that have gone before it. But let any one set all this aside and look simply and closely at the advances that have been actually made in all departments of scientific inquiry and of active life, and he cannot doubt that these boastings have some foundations. A great advance has certainly been made in the application of science and its principles to the daily affairs of life and activity. There is no department of labor, no branch of life, however humble, that has not been improved and elevated by the discoveries and inventions of science. Look at the difference in this respect alone, which distinguishes the present from the past. Consider the immense improvements that have been made in machinery and in mechanical instrumentalities of every kind; consider that farming itself has come to be deemed a scientific process, and that petitions, from thousands and tens of thousands of our fellow citizens now lie upon our table, asking for the establishment by our State, of an Agricultural College, in which the *science* of tilling the earth shall be thoroughly taught; observe how, in every department the great truth that *theory*—scientific insight and scientific principle—underlies all *practice*, however

mechanical and however humble,—observe how this truth has come at last to be universally recognized and made the basis of all labor and of all adventure; and then you will realize the necessity of making our schools keep pace with this advancing reformation and improvement of the times. It is essential for every one, who would succeed in any department of labor, to possess himself of all the advantages which invention and improvement have procured. To vie with his competitors, he must avail himself of every instrumentality which the knowledge of the age has devised. This necessity involves an acquaintance with the scientific discoveries and inventions of the day. No man can discharge the duties and attain the successes which the age requires, without that knowledge which alone gives him the ability to do so. Our system of Education, therefore, must be adapted to this universal necessity. Our Common Schools must be so improved that all this essential knowledge can be acquired under their provisions.

I have thus shown the necessity of constantly improving our State system of Education, first, by rendering its schools more universally and more easily accessible, and second, by elevating their character, enlarging their scope and increasing their efficiency. The bills now before the committee are of the highest importance from their close connection with this necessity. Fifty years ago the ability to read and write was considered, for the laboring classes of our community, a sufficient education; and the schools of that day sought, therefore, to teach but little more. How is it now? No matter how humble his position may be, or how purely mechanical the occupation in which he is engaged, that man would be considered ignorant,—unqualified for the humblest duties of citizenship and unprepared to labor in the humblest walks of life, whose intellectual culture had gone no further than this. Men now, to be good useful citizens, useful members of society, or even successful in any department of labor and of life, must be far more intelligent,—far more thoroughly disciplined,—far better educated than was requisite fifty or even twenty years ago. And it is by these bills that we are now seeking to bring the standard of our Common Schools up to this advancing necessity of the age in which we live.

These bills are also important because of their relation to the history of our legislation on the subject of Common Schools. The State of New York has always recognized its duty to aid in educating the children within its limits. It has endeavored to discharge that duty at every stage of its existence. As early

as in 1795 a law was passed making for five years an annual appropriation of \$50,000 for the support of Common Schools, and requiring an equal amount to be raised by tax upon the towns. The last payment under this act was made in 1801; and from that time until 1814, the schools of the State seem to have received no money from the State. But the State meantime was not indifferent to their interests, or to its own duty in regard to them. In 1805, the State set apart 500,000 acres of land as a permanent fund "for the encouragement of Common Schools," the income of which, after it should have become equal to \$50,000 a year, was to be distributed among the Common Schools. The first payment from this fund under this act, was made in 1814, and amounted to a little less than the *minimum* prescribed. But that appropriation laid the foundation of our present Common School Fund. By the watchful care of the State, and by an accession from moneys distributed by the Federal Government among the several States of the Union, that fund has increased from year to year, until it now amounts to more than two and a quarter millions, and yields a yearly income of three hundred thousand dollars. Up to the year 1849, a system prevailed of which the foundations were laid in 1812. The public money devoted to that purpose, was distributed among the districts in proportion to their population; and the deficiency requisite to pay the expenses of the school, was paid by rate-bill, assessed upon those attending the school. Indigent persons were exempted from the payment of school expenses, at the discretion of the trustees; and the amount thus exempted was assessed upon the property of the town.

The system worked well for many years. The schools were generally well sustained and well attended. The taxes levied to pay the expense of educating the children of the indigent were cheerfully paid. In several of the cities, meantime, another system had been adopted. Acts were passed by the Legislature, giving to these cities entire control over the schools within their limits. They generally established schools, as many as were required, threw the doors wide open to the *gratuitous* education of all their children, and taxed all their property to pay the expense thereof. They established FREE SCHOOLS—schools free to all—schools in which the children of the poor and the rich, the high and the humble, the learned and the ignorant, should sit down side by side, to receive the best education which the schools could give, free of all expense, so far as they or their parents or guardians were concerned. The principle was thus distinctly recognized, and carried into practical opera-

tion, that the PROPERTY of any community should *educate the children* of that community. In these cities,—New-York, Brooklyn, Rochester, Buffalo and others—it was found that under the Free School system which they had adopted, the expense of tuition was materially reduced. In five of those cities it was found that the average expense incurred for educating a child in their free schools, was \$1.73; while in the country districts, and under the rate-bill system, the average expense for the same time would be \$2.04 for each pupil taught. These facts began to attract the attention of the friends of education throughout the State; and in 1848, the Hon. N. S. BENTON, then Superintendent of Common Schools, brought the matter to the attention of the Legislature. In his Report of that year, (Ass. Doc. No. 5, p. 56,) after reciting the advantages which, as experience had shown, belonged to the Free School system, Mr. BENTON claimed, as an act of justice, the extension of that system to the country districts. I quote from that Report:

The extension of Free Schools in this State is progressing moderately: and laws are also passed nearly every session of the Legislature, providing for their establishment in populous and wealthy villages, while the poorer or less populous districts in the same towns, are left to struggle on from year to year, in the best way they can,—sustaining a school perhaps only four months in a year, to secure the next apportionment of public moneys. *Is this policy just? Is it right to discriminate in this manner between the children of the State?* Why should ample provision be made for the children residing in particular localities, and others turned over to the naked bounties of the State,—which, although munificent in the aggregate, are only sufficient to pay for a week's tuition for each child? This great and essential question turns simply on the mode of taxation: by changing this and requiring the Boards of Supervisors to raise upon the counties respectively, a sum equal to the amount apportioned from the Treasury to each county for the support of Schools, and upon the towns another sum equal to the apportionment of such towns from the School Fund, which would increase the local taxation upon the counties, not to exceed five-tenths of a mill on the valuation in any county, *and our schools might be rendered nearly FREE to every child in the State.*

In 1849 these representations were renewed by the Superintendant, (Hon. CHRISTOPHER MORGAN) the same who fills that office now. The injustice and impolicy of the existing system were forcibly presented. Eleven cities and towns, containing one-fifth of the entire population of the State, had established Free Schools, and it was universally believed that the public interests of the State demanded the extension of the system and that it would be sustained by public sentiment. A law was therefore enacted to establish Free Schools throughout the State. Its provisions were similar to those suggested by Mr. BENTON in 1848. The public moneys

country grows up to wealth and power. Those, on the contrary, who have left their own homes from no such foresight and with no such views of future independence, but who have fled under the impulse of sharp oppression, who have left their native land, because it had become to them a scourge and a curse,—whose scanty means were exhausted in the effort and who have found themselves, therefore, cast upon our shores penniless and friendless,—this is the class that must remain inhabitants of our State, and soon assume the duties and responsibilities which citizenship involves. These men are to take part in the government of our country. Their children are to share with ours the arduous and responsible task of protecting the rights, guiding the energies and building up the interests of this great State. For them, therefore, and for their interests,—for their own prosperity and for the welfare of the State whose interests are to be entrusted to their keeping, must our State system of Education be enlarged and improved. For them and for their children must our Common Schools be rendered more and more accessible. For them and theirs must our educational system keep pace with the increasing necessities of revolving years.

The progress of the times, moreover, requires that our schools should from year to year be made more and more efficient. There is beyond all doubt, much clamorous and absurd boasting about the progress of the age and its superiority over all the times that have gone before it. But let any one set all this aside and look simply and closely at the advances that have been actually made in all departments of scientific inquiry and of active life, and he cannot doubt that these boastings have some foundations. A great advance has certainly been made in the application of science and its principles to the daily affairs of life and activity. There is no department of labor, no branch of life, however humble, that has not been improved and elevated by the discoveries and inventions of science. Look at the difference in this respect alone, which distinguishes the present from the past. Consider the immense improvements that have been made in machinery and in mechanical instrumentalities of every kind; consider that farming itself has come to be deemed a scientific process, and that petitions, from thousands and tens of thousands of our fellow citizens now lie upon our table, asking for the establishment by our State, of an Agricultural College, in which the *science* of tilling the earth shall be thoroughly taught; observe how, in every department the great truth that *theory*—scientific insight and scientific principle—underlies all *practice*, however

mechanical and however humble,—observe how this truth has come at last to be universally recognized and made the basis of all labor and of all adventure; and then you will realize the necessity of making our schools keep pace with this advancing reformation and improvement of the times. It is essential for every one, who would succeed in any department of labor, to possess himself of all the advantages whic invention and improvement have procured. To vie with his competitors, he must avail himself of every instrumentality which the knowledge of the age has devised. This necessity involves an acquaintance with the scientific discoveries and inventions of the day. No man can discharge the duties and attain the successes which the age requires, without that knowledge which alone gives him the ability to do so. Our system of Education, therefore, must be adapted to this universal necessity. Our Common Schools must be so improved that all this essential knowledge can be acquired under their provisions.

I have thus shown the necessity of constantly improving our State system of Education, first, by rendering its schools more universally and more easily accessible, and second, by elevating their character, enlarging their scope and increasing their efficiency. The bills now before the committee are of the highest importance from their close connection with this necessity. Fifty years ago the ability to read and write was considered, for the laboring classes of our community, a sufficient education; and the schools of that day sought, therefore, to teach but little more. How is it now? No matter how humble his position may be, or how purely mechanical the occupation in which he is engaged, that man would be considered ignorant,—unqualified for the humblest duties of citizenship and unprepared to labor in the humblest walks of life, whose intellectual culture had gone no furthur than this. Men now, to be good useful citizens, useful members of society, or even successful in any department of labor and of life, must be far more intelligent,—far more thoroughly disciplined,—far better educated than was requisite fifty or even twenty years ago. And it is by these bills that we are now seeking to bring the standard of our Common Schools up to this advancing necessity of the age in which we live.

These bills are also important because of their relation to the history of our legislation on the subject of Common Schools. The State of New York has always recognized its duty to aid in educating the children within its limits. It has endeavored to discharge that duty at every stage of its existance. As early

as in 1795 a law was passed making for five years an annual appropriation of \$50,000 for the support of Common Schools, and requiring an equal amount to be raised by tax upon the towns. The last payment under this act was made in 1801; and from that time until 1814, the schools of the State seem to have received no money from the State. But the State meantime was not indifferent to their interests, or to its own duty in regard to them. In 1805, the State set apart 500,000 acres of land as a permanent fund "for the encouragement of Common Schools," the income of which, after it should have become equal to \$50,000 a year, was to be distributed among the Common Schools. The first payment from this fund under this act, was made in 1814, and amounted to a little less than the *minimum* prescribed. But that appropriation laid the foundation of our present Common School Fund. By the watchful care of the State, and by an accession from moneys distributed by the Federal Government among the several States of the Union, that fund has increased from year to year, until it now amounts to more than two and a quarter millions, and yields a yearly income of three hundred thousand dollars. Up to the year 1849, a system prevailed of which the foundations were laid in 1812. The public money devoted to that purpose, was distributed among the districts in proportion to their population; and the deficiency requisite to pay the expenses of the school, was paid by rate-bill, assessed upon those attending the school. Indigent persons were exempted from the payment of school expenses, at the discretion of the trustees; and the amount thus exempted was assessed upon the property of the town.

The system worked well for many years. The schools were generally well sustained and well attended. The taxes levied to pay the expense of educating the children of the indigent were cheerfully paid. In several of the cities, meantime, another system had been adopted. Acts were passed by the Legislature, giving to these cities entire control over the schools within their limits. They generally established schools, as many as were required, threw the doors wide open to the *gratuitous* education of all their children, and taxed all their property to pay the expense thereof. They established FREE SCHOOLS—schools free to all—schools in which the children of the poor and the rich, the high and the humble, the learned and the ignorant, should sit down side by side, to receive the best education which the schools could give, free of all expense, so far as they or their parents or guardians were concerned. The principle was thus distinctly recognized, and carried into practical opera-

tion, that the PROPERTY of any community should *educate the children* of that community. In these cities,—New-York, Brooklyn, Rochester, Buffalo and others—it was found that under the Free School system which they had adopted, the expense of tuition was materially reduced. In five of those cities it was found that the average expense incurred for educating a child in their free schools, was \$1.73; while in the country districts, and under the rate-bill system, the average expense for the same time would be \$2.04 for each pupil taught. These facts began to attract the attention of the friends of education throughout the State; and in 1848, the Hon. N. S. BENTON, then Superintendent of Common Schools, brought the matter to the attention of the Legislature. In his Report of that year, (Ass. Doc. No. 5, p. 56,) after reciting the advantages which, as experience had shown, belonged to the Free School system, Mr. BENTON claimed, as an act of justice, the extension of that system to the country districts. I quote from that Report :

The extension of Free Schools in this State is progressing moderately: and laws are also passed nearly every session of the Legislature, providing for their establishment in populous and wealthy villages, while the poorer or less populous districts in the same towns, are left to struggle on from year to year, in the best way they can,—sustaining a school perhaps only four months in a year, to secure the next apportionment of public moneys. *Is this policy just? Is it right to discriminate in this manner between the children of the State?* Why should ample provision be made for the children residing in particular localities, and others turned over to the naked bounties of the State,—which, although munificent in the aggregate, are only sufficient to pay for a week's tuition for each child? This great and essential question turns simply on the mode of taxation: by changing this and requiring the Boards of Supervisors to raise upon the counties respectively, a sum equal to the amount apportioned from the Treasury to each county for the support of Schools, and upon the towns another sum equal to the apportionment of such town from the School Fund, which would increase the local taxation upon the counties, not to exceed five-tenths of a mill on the valuation in any county, *and our schools might be rendered nearly FREE to every child in the State.*

In 1849 these representations were renewed by the Superintendent, (Hon. CHRISTOPHER MORGAN) the same who fills that office now. The injustice and impolicy of the existing system were forcibly presented. Eleven cities and towns, containing one-fifth of the entire population of the State, had established Free Schools, and it was universally believed that the public interests of the State demanded the extension of the system and that it would be sustained by public sentiment. A law was therefore enacted to establish Free Schools throughout the State. Its provisions were similar to those suggested by Mr. BENTON in 1848. The public moneys

were divided among those counties of the State in which schools should have been kept for a specified time during the preceding year. Upon the receipt of their share of the money, the Supervisors of each county were required to collect an equal amount by tax, upon the property of the county. And the towns were required to raise by a tax, a sum equal to the amount they might have received in the distribution. This provision was supposed to be sufficient to enable the several districts to maintain a school eight months in the year.—The *voters* in each district, however, were authorized to determine how long the school should be maintained; and the expense of maintaining them, as thus determined, was to be levied upon the *property* of the district.—This bill was submitted to the people in 1849, and was by them enacted into a law. It went into effect, and at once gave rise to the most extreme dissatisfaction. That provision authorising the *voters* of a district to levy a tax *ad libitum* upon the *property* of the district, in its practical operation, aroused the deepest and most bitter hostility. The Legislature in 1850—the two Houses being unable to agree upon any amendment of the law—submitted it again to the people of the State; and at the fall election of that year, the People of the State sustained the law, by a large majority, but with an evident dislike of its details.

And now we are assembled here to devise some school law which shall take its place.—Two systems of education have thus far prevailed, *first*, the rate-bill system; *second*, the free school system, embracing the power of *local* taxation. Our aim now must be to devise some system which shall avoid the defects and combine the advantages, of both those which have hitherto proved unsatisfactory.—We are to enact some State system of Education, which shall at once meet the *wants* of the *State* and the *approbation* of the *People*.

What kind of a Bill will attain these two essential ends?

I. In my judgment it must, in the first place, be a **FREE SCHOOL** Bill. It must embody, in some effective and satisfactory shape, the Free School principle. It must throw wide open every door in every school house within the State, to every child within the State. It must invite every child, no matter how rich or how poor, no matter how cared for or how friendless he may be, to enter the school house and receive, without money, and without price, the best instruction it can give him. Nothing less than this, in my opinion, will adequately meet the necessities of the State, or secure the permanent acquiescence and approbation of the people. And to carry this design into practical effect, the **PROPERTY** of the **State** must be taxed for its support.

In defence of this opinion I shall proceed to show, so far as I may be able, that the State owes to every child within its limits, such an education as will qualify him to discharge the duties, and to enjoy the privileges of citizenship. That every child ought to receive such an education, no one will deny. That this is essential to the stability and success of a republican government, no one can doubt. The duties which devolve upon every citizen of a Republic are such as to render mental and moral culture essential to their right performance. Every man in the State aids in making the laws by which that State is governed. He aids by his daily conduct in giving character to the society in which he lives. His own daily pursuits, his influence upon those around him, his discharge of all his social and civil duties, are all shaped and controlled by the intellectual and moral culture which he may have received. If he is ignorant, if he has never been taught the elements of learning, if his mind is uncultivated, his habits undisciplined, and his aims and purposes unmixed with that regard for other interests and other rights than his own, which education never fails to inspire, his business will suffer—he will fall behind his more enlightened competitor in any sphere of active exertion—his influence upon society will be selfish and degrading and his participation in the government of his country will bring peril upon all its institutions. Society, therefore, is directly and deeply concerned in the education of all its members. The State, for its own protection, in self-defence against the dangers which ignorance always involves, has a direct and paramount interest in the culture and right training of all her citizens. Regard for her own prosperity will compel the State to see to it, that every child within her borders receives that degree of education which will fit him for the proper performance of the important duties which will devolve upon him.

But it is said that it is the duty of Parents to educate their children. So it is. But this fact does not in any degree release or relieve the State from its duty. The children belong to the State quite as truly and in as important a sense, as they belong to their parents. The State needs them and uses them, long after they have left their parents. It claims them as the guardians of its interests. It requires them to make its laws. It demands their services as jurors, to determine rights and to punish wrongs; as magistrates, to enforce the laws which they have helped to make; as soldiers to defend it from attack from without and within; and as citizens, to discharge all the duties which that comprehensive relation requires. Their duties as citi-

zens outlast and override their duties as children. They continue to be citizens long after they have ceased to be children. It is, therefore, more important to the State, than it is to their parents even, that they should be fitted by education to discharge their duties to the State aright. Parents educate their children, not for themselves, not for their own advantage, but for society. They send them to school, not merely nor mainly, that they may learn their duty as children, but that they may be fitted for useful and honorable activity in the world. Parents educate their children for the State. They are only *agents* of the State in doing this needful and important work. If, therefore, parents fail to do it, for any reason whatever, whether from poverty or from vice, —not matter what the cause may be—if they fail to educate their children, the State must do it. Regard for its own safety requires it. Self-defence is always a duty—and the highest duty of an individual or a community; and **SELF-DEFENCE** requires that **THE STATE** should educate all the children who are within its limits.

I do not mean to say, or to intimate, that the agency of parents is not the natural and proper agency to be employed in the education of children—but simply that the duty of the State to secure them an education, is superior to that of parents and independent of it. If all parents would do their duty in this respect—if all were able and willing to educate their children, it would be safe and proper for the State to leave this duty with them and trust to them for its performance. But experience shows that this is not the case.—The majority of parents feel the obligation that rests upon them and discharge it fully. The great mass of our people educate their children. But there are thousands and tens of thousands upon whom this duty may not safely be devolved. There are thousands who are *unable* to perform it, who are too poor to pay the expense of sending their children even to our Common Schools. The gentleman from Tompkins (Mr. FERRIS) said a few days since, in speaking upon this subject, that there were very few in this country too poor to educate their children, unless they had been made so by intemperance or some other vice. Grant it to its fullest extent; how does it in the least degree diminish the claims of their children for an education? Those who through vice are unable or unwilling to perform this duty, are many; and is it not quite as important for society that *their* children should be educated, as those of that smaller, but still numerous class whose poverty is not the result of crime or of vicious indulgence? *Their* children also are to become citizens.—

They, as well as others, are to take part in making and in executing the laws. To them, as well as to others, is to be entrusted the solemn and responsible duties of social and civil life. Upon them, as upon others, must the State rely for that intelligence, that virtue and that patriotism essential to its prosperity. The State, therefore, has just as much interest in educating them, as it has in educating others. And aside from the interest of the community in this matter, the children themselves have a right to the same culture which those blessed with wealthier parents receive. They are innocent, and must not be punished for the sins of those who gave them birth.—The child of the vilest drunkard on the face of the earth, may justly claim from the State he is destined to serve, the education to fit him for that service.

I have thus shown that the State must educate all its children in some way, and by some agency; and that the agency of parents in this work cannot always be relied on. There is an immense number of children within the State, who do not, and cannot receive from their parents the education which they need. The State, therefore, must take into its own hand, the duty of supplying that want. This point, also, will be generally conceded.

But it is also essential, in my opinion, that all the children in the State, while receiving that training which is to fit them for the duties of after life, should stand upon the same footing. They are all to be educated for the duties of a Republican government; and the fundamental principle of that form of civil policy is, that all men in the eye of the law and the State are *equal*,—that all places and all duties are open to all its citizens. To preserve the purity and simplicity of a Republican State, it is necessary that this sentiment of equality should be respected and cherished,—that every citizen should be under its influence,—the highest, that his grasping and selfish ambition may be checked, and the lowest that his honorable impulses and aims may not be discouraged. Now how can this be done, when, in the schools where all are to receive the very elements of mental and of moral culture, a clear and broad distinction is drawn between them? The old law provided that one child should be educated by his parents, and another, in the discretion of the trustees, at the public expense. One sat upon the pupils bench, the independent purchaser of the education which he sought; the other sitting by his side, his equal in talent, in character and ambition, must first be degraded by the pauper's brand before he could enter upon the tasks of the school. Now I am willing to admit that the elements of mental culture may be learned

even under circumstances so humbling and unpromising as these. The child of poverty may learn to read and to write at the expense of the town, perhaps quite as well as the rich man's son who sits by his side. But will this necessary degrading of himself to a lower level than that of his fellow, have no effect upon his character as a man and as a citizen? Will he in after life, have the same feeling of self respect, the same sense of manly independence, the same conviction: not haughty and assuming but quiet and clear—of Republican equality, as if he had not gone through this humbling process? Will he, when he goes abroad among his fellow men, when he meets them at the ballot-box, or in the courts of justice, when he sits beside them in these or other halls of legislation,—will he feel thoroughly and calmly, his equitable equality with those who stand or who sit by his side? Could you or I, Sir, preserve this feeling? No, Sir. The child who is educated as a pauper, will carry the feeling of a pauper through life. It is a mistake, Sir, to suppose that children are insensible, or indifferent, to such distinctions. I have seen enough, and you have seen enough, in our experience, to convince us of this, even if our knowledge of human nature were not sufficient. Every man and every child has within him a feeling—call it of pride—call it of unworthy selfishness and conceit, if you will—it is none the less real, none the less effective on that account,—a feeling of self respect, which is wounded and deadened by treatment founded on such distinctions. It is folly, Sir, it is worse than folly, to educate a child as a pauper, and expect him to carry into life the feelings and the habits with which a sense of that condition is most at war. And the Common School-house is the last place on earth where such distinctions should be allowed to enter. It is there that the most lasting impressions of life are made. It is there that the sentiments which give character to the man, have their birth and commence their growth. It is there that the elements of the future are found. Distinctions drawn there last through life. The influences which are brought to bear upon the child there, give shape and direction to his course and his character thereafter. Is this the place, then, to draw a line of demarcation so broad as that which separates the child of wealth and the child of charity,—the child who buys his education and the child who receives it as an alms?

It seems to me, Sir, inevitable that such a training would work disaster in the State. It seems to me, if not full of peril to our best interests and our richest institutions, to fall far short of that manly culture which a republican

State should give. I would have all, Sir, stand upon the same level—receive their education from the same source, and owe their gratitude and allegiance to the same civil community. The only way of course, in which this can be done, is by having them all educated in the same schools, and at the expense of the State. I would have the child of the rich and the poor, to stand upon a common level, while they are receiving that mental culture which is to fit them for equal and common duties hereafter.

If these things be so—if it is just and expedient that the State should, in its sovereign and civil capacity, provide for the free education of its children, it follows of course that the PROPERTY within its limits must be taxed to pay for it. The property of its citizens is the only agency, the only instrumentality by which a State can execute these designs which may be judged essential to its safety and prosperity. This principle is so clearly illustrated in the experience of daily life, that argument in its support would be superfluous. The State needs defence against foreign invasion and internal rebellion,—that defence is furnished by the property of its citizens. The State needs Courts of law, executive and judicial officers, magistrates and a police, Government and a legislature,—and the property of its citizens—all the property within its limits, and under its protection—is taxed to pay for their support. Whenever the community needs service or instruments of any kind, she takes from the property of her citizens to pay for them. And the justice of so doing is universally conceded. Show but the necessity of the service required, and the property to pay for it is cheerfully and ungrudgingly supplied. The principle it seems to me fully sanctions the policy of a general tax for purposes of education. The State requires for her own safety and prosperity, that every child within her limits should receive a free education in Common Schools. This is for her an essential service—as essential as armies, or courts, or legislative halls, for without it all these are worthless: Why then, does it not follow, of necessity, that she may rightfully call upon her property to meet this essential and imperative want?

If I have at all succeeded in my purpose, I have established by fair argument, and upon grounds generally conceded to be good, the equity of the principle that *the property of the State should be taxed to educate the children of the State*. I might urge, in addition to what I have already said in support of this position, the more obvious considerations, that property is directly benefited by education: that the value of property in any locality always de-

pends to no inconsiderable extent, upon the intelligence, the culture, the education of its inhabitants; that general education tends directly and powerfully to diminish crime and pauperism, and thus to diminish the expense which property is compelled to bear, of maintaining courts, prisons and poor-houses. But this is not essential to my present purpose, and it will moreover, have been already suggested by the reflection and the experience of every one whom I address. I, therefore, rest upon the reasons I have already urged in support of the principle I have laid down.

I shall now consider the several *objections* by which, from various quarters, the truth of this principle is contested and the expediency of its practical operation denied.

1. It is said in reply that every man is the absolute owner of his own property, and that he cannot rightfully be compelled to part with it for the benefit of others. This is certainly true, if reference be had only to the private use and benefit of others. But it is not true in regard to taking private property for the public good. No man is so absolutely sovereign over his possessions as to preclude their seizure whenever the public necessities or the public welfare require it. All men hold their property subordinate to the necessities of society and the State, and of those necessities society and the State are to be the judges.—Nor is this always confined to cases in which the individual owner is himself to be directly benefited by such an appropriation of his property. He is regarded and treated as a part of society—as having interests identical with its interests and dependent upon its preservation and prosperity. If New York city were to be invaded by a foreign foe, property in Buffalo, whose owners might not have the slightest personal interest in the issue, would be taxed and taken for its defence. If Buffalo were attacked and conquered by a mob, New York city would be taxed to pay for its suppression. Men are daily called upon to aid in making roads they never travel—in building bridges they never cross, in buying weapons they never use, and in making laws they never need. The State is sovereign over all property so far as its own necessities and interests require. Property is rightfully protected from private spoliation. Society surrounds it with all needful safeguards, and puts forth all its powers to defend it from unjust invasion. But property has its duties as well as its rights. The fact that its rights are recognized and protected creates duties and obligations from which it cannot escape. It must contribute to defend society in turn. It must contribute, not only to arm its hands and give power to its exertions, but to elevate its

character, to purify its spirit, to make it wiser, more intelligent, more virtuous, and better in every respect. For all such purposes, therefore, the individual owner of property may rightfully and properly be asked to contribute such a portion thereof as may be required. He is not the owner of his own in so absolute a sense as would render it unjust to call upon him for such service. He is a member of society, identified with it, prospering as it prospers, failing when it fails, sharing its advance and backward movements—the creature of its growth and the debtor to its prosperity. His own interest, therefore, is in harmony with his duty to devote his property to whatever will promote the essential and permanent well being of the society of which he forms a part.

2. It is said that no man ought to be compelled to educate another's children.—And why not, pray? Has he no interest in their being educated? Is it a matter of indifference to him whether they, who are soon to grow up and become his neighbors and his fellow-citizens, whether they grow up virtuous and intelligent or ignorant and vicious? They are to form a part of his society. They are to share with him the powers and the duties which citizenship involves. They are to stand by his side, enjoy equal rights and exercise equal power with him. They are to aid in giving character and tone to the community of which he is a member, and with which his interests are identified. Is it a matter of no consequence to him, then, what is to be their future character and their future fate? Is it a matter of no importance to him whether they grow up virtuous citizens, industrious men, useful members of society, or outcasts, vagabonds and thieves?—So far as the society is concerned, of which he and they are parts alike, his interest is as great and his duty as clear in having them educated, as the interest and the duty of the parents themselves. It is for him as well as for them to see that they are fitted for usefulness in after life—fitted to be blessings instead of curses to the society which enfolds them all. And upon him, as upon every other member of that society, devolves the duty of bringing that result about.

Those who have already educated their own children at their own expense, it is urged in connection with this objection, ought not to be compelled to aid in the instruction of others; as they are thereby enforced to bear a double burden. The objection touches only the time and manner in which the principle shall be applied—it does not affect the principle itself. If the State had *always* had Free Schools, supported by its property, no one

would be in the position which the plea supposes. The objection, therefore, only shows that the State ought to have adopted that policy at first; it does not justify the inference that it should not adopt it now. Besides, it is only temporary in its effect. After a few years all will stand upon the same footing in this respect—sharing the same blessings and bearing the same burdens of the system alike. The same objection, moreover, would preclude the introduction of any new and valuable measure which had been too long delayed. There would always be some in society who had passed the point at which it could be of advantage to them, and yet they, too, would be justly compelled to share its burdens.

3. It is asked, why is not the State bound to ensure its children food and clothing as well as an education? Life is certainly quite as essential—the ordinary comforts of life are quite as important, for all the inhabitants of a State, as education is; why, then, is it not the duty of property also to feed and clothe the children of the State? It is and is so acknowledged to be, theoretically at least, by every civilized community on the face of the earth. The laws upon our statute books, making provision for the support of the poor, furnish abundant evidence of the fact. In this State as in all other States, houses and lands are set apart in every county for the support of those within its borders, who are unable to support themselves, and the property of that community is compelled to bear the expense. There are abundant reasons why this appropriation cannot take the same form as is proposed by a Free School System—so far as the form is concerned the two cases are not alike. The analogy between them is not close enough in this particular, to give the slightest weight to the objection, even if its principle were correct. But it is not correct. The principle is distinctly recognized and practically enforced in every State, that its property should feed and clothe all its inhabitants. And this fact gives increased force and clearness to this principle which exacts from property the education of the children of the State. For so far as the proper discharge of the duties of citizenship are concerned,—so far as regards the essential interest and welfare of society, education is the first necessity—more essential even than food and clothing, after that point which secures existence is passed.

4. But again, it is urged that the principle by which Free Schools are vindicated is Socialism—that it is one of the fundamental principles of Fourierism. The attempt to establish Free Schools is ridiculed as part of the Reform movements of the day. I have

had, sir, comparatively little experience in public life, but I have seen enough of it and known enough of its duties and responsibilities to establish in my mind the conviction, that the man who lacks the firmness to face opprobrious epithets—who is scared by *names* from advocating principles which he believes to be just, will be far more serviceable in the retirement of private life, than in stations where clear convictions and a courageous adherence to them are indispensable to usefulness and success. I have been in a position to know something of Fourierism, and of the principles upon which it is based. Many of its fundamental positions I believe to be certainly erroneous, and as a whole I deem the system visionary and impracticable. But I can assure those who have been prevented by their prejudices, or any other cause, from giving it a careful and candid examination, that it is in many respects one of the most remarkable productions of human speculation the world has ever seen, and that it embodies some principles which are not only just and important to the well being of society, but which will be gradually infused into its organic action by that constant progress which is its law. Now I have no doubt that the principle which makes the State responsible for the education of all its children, would find favor with those who espouse this special system of social reform. But does that fact demonstrate its fallacy? Is it such an argument as should convince the judgment and control the conduct of any man who professes to be governed by reason and not by prejudice? A false system may embrace much that is true. In fact, no false system ever acquired any degree of strength, or commanded for any time the assent of any respectable portion of the public, except by means of the truth which it embodied. The worst delusions which have ever prevailed have had some truth at bottom to keep the fraud in countenance. Now I believe that there are principles embodied in the social system of Fourier, which are true, and important to the public good—and this I hold is one of them. The fact that it is pressed into the service of a false and unsound system, is not conclusive against its worth. It does not, in the slightest degree, invalidate the argument adduced in its support.

But this whole Free School System, it is said, is part of the "Reform movement" of the day. It had its origin there. It started, says the gentleman from Tompkins, (Mr. Ferris,) in New York, that hot-bed of social reforms, and is therefore tainted with the fallacy and the humbug which belonged to them. Now, sir, I am not a very ardent admirer of many who seek by clamor and pretension to

remodel the world. I have no great respect for *professional* reformers—for men or women who suppose they have a "mission" to overthrow all existing institutions and usages, and

"Frame a world of better stuff."

They are generally persons of sharp but unbalanced minds, and sometimes are as unprincipled as they are eccentric. But, sir, it will not do to pass sweeping judgment of indiscriminate condemnation upon any class of men, and least of all upon those who are engaged, directly or indirectly, in the various projects of improving the condition of society which attract so much attention at the present day. They differ as other men differ. Their schemes differ as other schemes, all of which seek a common object, differ among themselves. Some are wiser than others. Some are sensible and others are absurd. Some of the men who embrace them are honest, and seek solely the good of their fellows,—while others are selfish and seek only their own advantage. And that difference must be recognized in our judgment of them. I know it is fashionable to sneer at every movement which claims to be reform, and to denounce, as radical and destructive to society, every effort to elevate and improve the condition of the poor and the wretched. I can easily conceive, sir, that gentlemen who have lived all their lives in the country districts of our State, and who know nothing of poverty but what they see of it there, should to some extent share this feeling. I can easily understand how they can see no necessity for such reform. But, sir, let them turn from the general comfort and competence which characterize our rural population; let them live, as I have lived for a time, in the densely crowded cities of our State, and look closely and with an open heart at the scenes which will there meet their view and I will answer for it their disposition to sneer at efforts, however inadequate, to remedy these evils, will not increase. I have seen too much, sir, of life in cities, I have come too closely in contact with the sad contrasts which city life presents, and with the keen sufferings to which the innocent and helpless are there exposed, to look with contempt or indifference upon any honest effort to improve their condition or relieve their fate.

Go, sir, with me to the lanes and courts of our cities, where men, women and children are crowded into the closest space; enter the dens where they maintain a wretched and a feeble existence, victims by turns of hunger, of cold and of unattended and unrelieved disease; see the homeless mother driven from

the door of superfluous wealth, where she had sought food for her helpless child; and then reflect that these are our brethren, men of the same feelings and wants with ourselves, women and children just as keenly alive to pain and suffering, and just as accessible to all pleasures and to all griefs as those over whom we watch with such deep concern, and in whose lightest sufferings we so keenly share. Is there not enough here to stir the sensibilities of a feeling heart? Take these cases home to yourselves, and that is the best way of judging any case. Imagine your children begging for food—your families houseless and comfortless, and yourselves crushed to the earth by poverty and misfortune, which were not the result of crime or of fault upon your part. Would you not look with charity at least upon efforts for your relief? Would you not deem him hard-hearted who should denounce them as fanatics and fools, because all their notions and all their plans did not square exactly with his own? I do not desire in the least to exaggerate the sufferings, or to over-rate the miseries of the lower classes of the poor in our cities. I know that the liberality, the Christian sympathy of those to whom Providence has been more propitious, have done and are doing much to relieve and improve their condition. But there is still enough left of misery and of destitution,—enough of degradation and of wretchedness, to appal the stoutest and to touch the hardest heart. And while this is so, I cannot turn coldly and scornfully from any scheme for its relief. I cannot scoff or sneer at any who are engaged in honest efforts, however impracticable or absurd I may deem them, to procure a remedy. I am inclined, sir, to grasp at anything that holds out the faintest promise of redemption from this dismal abyss of wretchedness and woe.

I have thus endeavored to sustain the principle of **FREE Schools**, sustained by a tax upon all the property of the State, by argument and to vindicate it from the objections by which it is opposed.

II.—I further insist that this committee should adopt a Free School bill, because the **PEOPLE** of this State have decided, in the most distinct and emphatic manner, that the *Free School principle should be sustained*.—The present Free School law was first submitted to the people in 1849, and was sustained by an almost unanimous vote. That vote was given without any accurate knowledge of the details of the bill, for it had never been carried into practical operation. But it was distinctly and universally known that it was a *Free School bill*. Every voter saw

by his ballot that he was to vote for or against the Free School principle. And this was then supposed to be the only principle involved—for nothing was generally known of the details of the law. Well, sir, what was the result? Why the principle was affirmed by a majority of nearly a hundred thousand!—No serious opposition in fact was brought against it. When presented simply in that shape, it was scarcely contested at all in any part of the State. When the law went into effect, it was found to embody provisions which rendered its practical operation oppressive in the highest degree. It became obnoxious from its complicated character. It required first a county and then a town tax, and finally put it into the power of the *voters* of a district to tax the *property* of the district *ad libitum*. It is not at all surprising that the law became obnoxious. It would have been singular indeed if it had been otherwise. The result was that at the last session of the Legislature we had numerous petitions,—not for the repudiation of the Free School *principle*, but for the repeal or modification of the existing Free School Law. The two Houses were unable to agree upon any substitute. The Assembly passed a bill similar to that now reported by the minority. The Senate did not concur, but sent down a bill again submitting the law to the *votes* of the people. Accordingly at the last election it was voted upon.—And the question put was not whether *any* Free School law should or should not be enacted, but whether the existing law, with all its odious features, universally obnoxious as it was, should or should not be *repealed*.—And yet, notwithstanding the unpromising and disadvantageous form in which the issue was made, the people of the State decided by the very large majority of 25,000 votes, that the Free School law should be sustained. Now it seems to me that this is the strongest possible way in which the Free School principle could be affirmed. It was presented in its harshest form. It was made to carry weight. It was loaded down with all the imperfections all the oppressive and obnoxious features of the existing law. And yet it was sustained by a larger majority than is often given for any measure whatever. Had the question been stripped of its obnoxious features, had it been presented apart from the severe and justly odious exactions of that bill, no man can doubt that it would have been affirmed by a still larger and more decisive majority.

These two successive votes, it seems to me, are perfectly conclusive as to the *principle* of Free Schools. They show beyond all cavil, that a very large majority of the people of this State desire that principle to be em-

bodied in the Common School system of the State. And I am therefore desirous that a bill should be adopted by this committee, based upon it and yet freed entirely from the obnoxious details by which the former bill was encumbered.

But, it is said, in reply to this, the city of New York cast a majority of 30,000 against the repeal of the Free School law, and that her vote ought not to have been counted, inasmuch as she was especially exempted from the operation of the law. If reference be had solely to the existing law, the objection is entitled to weight. But this was not the whole extent of the issue taken at that election.—The proposition to enact another law which should operate over the whole State, had been already made; and it was generally and distinctly understood that such a law would probably be enacted. And in that view of the case, New York city was certainly just as much entitled to vote as any other section of this great State. Both the bills now before this committee—all the bills indeed, that have been introduced into the Legislature, propose an extension of the school system to New York and all other cities in the State. Why, then, should not their *vote* be counted? The gentleman from Tompkins, (Mr. FERRISS,) by whom this objection was urged a few days since, at the same time argued, and justly in my judgement, that the city of New York ought to be *taxed* for the support of schools throughout the State. He based his argument on the close connection which she sustains to the rest of the State—a connection which he justly and forcibly illustrated by reference to that which subsists between the stomach and the limbs. It would be quite as proper, he said, for the limbs to refuse to work for the body, as for New York city to refuse to pay her share for the support of Common Schools throughout the State.—Well sir, I agree with him entirely. And the city which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, entertains the same idea of her relations and her duties. She knows—and she rejoices in the knowledge, that she is part of this great State. She knows that its fortunes are her fortunes—that she prospers in its prosperity, and that whatever is essential for its advancement, is also essential for her own. She expects and is willing to share its burthens, for she knows she must share its destiny. And certainly if it is right she should be *taxed* for the support of Common Schools, it is also right that she should *vote* upon them.

[CONTINUED IN NEXT NUMBER.]

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION.

EDITORS:

S. S. RANDALL, W. F. PHELPS, & J. McKEEN.

ALBANY, JUNE 1, 1851.

The Teacher's Mission.

There are in the State of New York, eleven thousand and five hundred public schools, in which eight hundred thousand children, between the ages of four and twenty-one, are annually instructed during a longer or shorter period, by teachers holding certificates of qualification prescribed by law. The whole number of children between the ages of five and sixteen, residing in the State has been ascertained to be about 750,000; and the number between the ages of four and five, and between those of sixteen and twenty-one probably does not exceed one hundred thousand. The great mass of the youth of the State, of both sexes receives, therefore, the rudiments of education in our common schools: and it is in these institutions that the gems of character are mainly developed and directed. Making all due allowance for the principles imbibed, the habits formed, and the impulses received in the family circle—for the peculiar social circumstances which encompass each pupil, and the numerous and varying influences to which, during the period of his minority, he is subjected, it may yet safely and truly be asserted, that the chief elements which go to make up the complex web of future character, and conduct—to determine the position of the individual in society—his capacities of usefulness—his disposition and habits—and his entire destiny for time and for eternity—are the result of the instruction or want of instruction—the mental and moral culture, or want of culture—received during the period of his attendance at the elementary school. It has been clearly and conclusively shown by the highest testimony of which the nature of the case admits, that with our present knowledge of the art and science of education, and with the aid of teachers of the highest attainable grade of competency, ninety-nine children out of every hundred, subjected to the care and instruction of such teachers, for a period of ten months in each year, between the ages of four and sixteen, would become unexceptionable and useful members of society, temperate, industrious, frugal, conscientious in all their dealings, public spirited, philanthropic, honest dealers, conscientious jurors, true witnesses, incorruptible electors, upright magistrates, good parents and good neighbors. If, therefore, these results are not produced under our existing systems of instruction, a fearful amount of the responsibility for the failure, must rest upon the great body of teachers. And this responsibility does not attach itself so much to any deficiency in their *intellectual* qualifications, as to the far too general neglect on their part, to bestow a due regard upon the development and culture of the *moral* faculties of their pupils. It is here that in our judgement, a large proportion of

our teachers fail in fulfilling the true ideal of their vocation. In the vast majority of our elementary institutions of learning, the *intellect* is almost exclusively cultivated, as through that alone, the great objects of human existence were capable of being attained. That portion of the teacher's time and labor which is devoted to the culture of the *affections*,—to the discipline of the *heart*—to the careful and thorough eradication of every vicious propensity—to the inculcation of the cardinal principles of integrity, benevolence, beneficence, strict and unwavering conscientiousness—and to the communication of an abiding appreciation of the higher and nobler elements of humanity, instead of constituting, as it should, the principal share, ordinarily amounts to a very inconsiderable and trifling fraction, when compared with that spent in the direct communication of scientific instruction. The necessary consequence of this state of things must be obvious. In the absence of any counteracting agencies from the domestic circle, or the society in which he is accustomed to mingle, the pupil is encouraged to regard the acquisition of *science* as the paramount object of his being—to concentrate the chief energies of his nature upon its attainment—and to regard all other pursuits as secondary and comparatively unimportant and useless. There surely can be no greater or more fatal delusion; and the entire experience of humanity, if it has any lesson more legibly inscribed than any other upon the tablets of history, has demonstrated the utter inefficiency and incompetency of mere *knowledge* to secure the happiness and well being of the race. The development and cultivation of the *moral* nature must take precedence of all other instruction, and any theory of education which fails adequately and fully to provide for this primal necessity of our being, is fatally defective and incomplete. The consequences of neglect here are irremediable. They tinge the whole future current of life. They poison the stream at the fountain; and render it dark and turbid throughout its entire course.

In this age of materialism—surrounded as we are on every hand by the devotees of worldly interests, selfish ambition and sensual pleasures—the true function and responsibility of the teacher, in this respect, is well deserving of our most serious consideration. The influence he must necessarily and unavoidably exert upon the future character and destiny of those committed to his charge—demands at his hands, the consecration of the noblest energies of his nature, the highest and purest aspirations of his being, to the great task in which he is engaged. He must divest himself of every selfish feeling—of every ignoble and unworthy passion—and place himself upon a level, so far as he may be able, with the unperverted innocence, simplicity and guilelessness of those "little ones" whose expanding faculties he is to guide and direct. While communicating to them the elementary principles of science, he must assiduously impress upon their docile and susceptible minds, the fundamental truths of reli-

gion, virtue and morality. In the bright morning of their young existence, he must familiarize their budding ideas with the conceptions of duty, obligation, responsibility—with the beauty of a life in harmonious accordance with the perfect laws of the Creator—with the utter repulsiveness of vice, and evil, to the constitution of our higher and nobler nature—and with an abiding conviction of the immortality of the soul, and the perpetual presence and providence of its Great Author. Before their intellectual and moral faculties shall have become contaminated by the deep depravity of the world, it is the duty of the teacher to guard them against the fearful and deadly perils which await them, by the inculcation of fixed principles of virtue and integrity, and the careful eradication of every gem of evil.

Our Enterprise.

Education has in recent years become an absorbing topic. Every body feels qualified to make some estimate of its necessity and value. Illiteracy and ignorance are associated in the minds of the multitude in the category of low breeding—as its concomitants. The low vices of profanity and vain boasting, are not in vogue in good society. Intemperance and duelling are rather evidences of evanished virtue, than a good education. The sections of country which are exceptions to these remarks, are constantly yielding to the onward pressure of advancing civilization. Sound opinions in morals, and tolerant practices in religion, have had their influences in fraternizing neighborhoods, and greatly promoting that associated action and co-operation so necessary for the advancement of learning in the district schools of our State and country.

In times past one of the greatest barriers to the diffusion of useful knowledge among all classes in the community, was the want of a Press devoted entirely to the cause of education; and so managed as to gather into its columns the practical wisdom of the most experienced educationists, and so diffused and distributed, as to reach the small districts, where youth and inexperience present the strongest claims for sympathy and instruction.

It is our object to meet this demand, and to bring into requisition more of the latent talent which has been revealed to us during the last few years, in which there has been a fraternity of teachers in partial co-operation.

We have desired, in the conducting of our Journal, to make it subservient to the general cause of education, as well as conducive to the particular necessities of inexperienced teachers. In proportion as the duties of the teacher's vocation are understood and practised, will we find schools increased and made better, and the social condition of the community improved. In proportion as we find a well-directed moral energy exerted in disseminating itself in our healthful fountains of elementary instruction, shall we see

prospering in long and beautiful succession, the virtues and amenities, the arts and the sciences, and all the accessory social enjoyments which refine and elevate the human character above objects that are mere transient and sensuous.

The government of our State and country are fairly committed to the sustentation of schools, to the diffusion of knowledge and to the inculcation of an elevated morality based upon the religion of the Bible.—We shall ever consider it our bounden duty to remember that our advocacy in the union of papers is pledged to these great and cardinal principles, and no desire of gain or hope of popular applause will ever allow us so to deviate from this prescribed line of duty, as in any way to compromise, or jeopard, these great ends.

We invoke the co-operation of all the teachers and the friends of knowledge and virtue throughout our State and land, to further the legitimate object of this paper, which is nothing short of the improvement of the rising portion of our species.

State of Knowledge in Turkey.

The state of knowledge among the Turks, as it was about thirty years ago, and as it still is with some small advance, is strongly exhibited in Dr. Walsh's "Residence in Constantinople." The following are instances: In 1820, a British Indiaman, by the way of Gibraltar, brought a cargo of coffee from Mocha to the Turkish capital. The Turks had long made use of coffee from the West Indies; but they soon perceived that the Arabian coffee was of a higher flavor, and consequently worth a higher price. Dealers were eager to learn whence this superior coffee came. Some persons who had traveled in pilgrimage to Mecca, affirmed that it was brought, directly, from the Red Sea into the Mediteranean. In all discussions on this matter, nothing but the grossest ignorance of the configuration of the earth was apparent.

Lord Strangford, the British Minister, thinking to throw some light upon this thick darkness, determined to send to the Sultan a pair of globes which he had brought from England. He was encouraged to do this, because some men of high station in the capital had lately manifested a desire to learn languages; the Minister concluded, therefore, that this might be an opportunity to teach them something else. According to this design he desired Dr. Walsh, his Chaplain, to convey the globes in his name to the Sultan, and also to explain their uses as much as he might, to the chief functionary of the court.

"I undertook," says Dr. Walsh, "the arduous task of giving the Turkish Ministers the first lecture on the globes which they ever received. They had, however, seen an artificial globe, and they called it *carpoos*.

Now *carpoos* is the Turkish name for the only species of gourd they have which is perfectly spherical, so for the same reason, they call the globe a water-melon.

"This important present was offered with becoming

respect. An officer of the Imperial household led the way; then followed two Janissaries (of that formidable military corps since annihilated,) bearing, like two Atlases, worlds on their shoulders; then myself and a *Dragoman*; (interpreter) and finally a train of attendants. When arrived at the palace we were received by the Reis Effendi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who, with other Ministers, waited for us—When I had the globes upon their frames put together, the Reis Effendi, who thought he, from his function, ought to know something of geography, put on his spectacles and began to examine them. The first thing that struck them was the compass in the stand. When they observed that the needle always kept the same position, they expressed great surprise, and thought it was done by some interior mechanism. I endeavored to explain to them that the needle was always found pointing nearly to the North. It was noon, and the shadow fell in that direction, and I could not make them believe that the needle would not follow the sun.

"The Reis Effendi then asked me to show him England. When I pointed out the comparatively small spot on the globe, he turned to the rest, and said, "Kutchuk," and they all repeated in various tones of contempt, "Kutchuk," *little*. But when I showed them the dependencies of the Empire, and particularly India, they said, "Buyuk," *big*, with some marks of respect.

"I then took occasion to show them the only mode of coming from thence to Constantinople by sea, and also, that a ship could not come from Mocha across the Isthmus. The newly appointed Dragoman of the Sultan, who had been a Jew, was imbued with a slight tincture of information, so after explaining to him as much as I could make him understand, I left to him the task of further instructing the Ministers in this new science."

A few years previous to this time, early in the present century, the first American vessel, a ship of war, appeared off Constantinople. The Commander, Commodore Bainbridge, related to me the reception he met with. He despatched a boat with the United States flag, announcing that he had come amicably to the Porte from his own government. The answer was that the Minister had no knowledge of the United States, and demanded where was such a country.—Explanations followed, and the Turkish functionary, with the Sultan, were found to have heard of the "New World." Subsequently, the Commodore was honorably received, and his intercourse with the foreign residents of Constantinople enabled the Sultan and his Ministers, to comprehend the existence and dignity of the American republic. It was at this time, Commodore Bainbridge and his officers were introduced to that enlightened English traveller, Dr. Clarke. I remember he told me that some water from the ship's store was brought to the table at which he dined with Dr. Clarke, and mingled with some of the same

element, drawn from the neighboring Asiatic province, together with that from a European source. This was done rather to express mutual good feeling, and blended interests of different States represented at that table, than to provide a well-flavored draught.

During the last twenty years the torpid Turkish mind has been somewhat awakened, so that several young men have been sent to Western Europe, to England and Germany, for education; and have returned well informed of the arts, sciences, and policy of those countries. Their accomplishments have not been overlooked at home; and Turkey, at this hour, is under partial correction of old abuses from this source. In the present age of the world nations are not born in a day; they are slowly emancipated from false opinions and bad practices; it is only when the necessity of reform is admitted, and the zeal for improvement ascertains the means and detail of it, that men turn from the error of their ways, to do that which is lawful and right.

E. ROBBINS.

Etymological Hints.

BY B. H. HAYES.

NO. 1.

Query. Is not the primary significative of every monosyllable whose root letters consist of the lingual *r* and a *labial*, uniformly, that of *to part, break or rive*?

In evidence of the affirmation of the above query, is subjoined the following lists of words, accompanied with proposed etymologies of those words in the lists whose primary signification is not manifest.

*First list of words having, for their root letters, *r* and one of the cognates, *b*, *f*, *m*, *p*, *v*, *w*.*

Bare, v. Denotes, primarily, *to separate, or make separate*: hence, to make alone, naked, destitute.

Bare, a. Primarily, as an adjective, *separate*: hence, the customary, *sig.*, alone, uncovered, destitute.

Bar, v. Prim., *to separate, part or break*: hence, to obstruct, hinder, exclude.

Bear, v. Prim., *to separate, or cause to break forth*, viz: from one's self; and as the *offspring* is usually sustained, and if a fruit, universally borne by its parent: hence also, to uphold, sustain, carry.

Bore, v. Prim., *to separate*: in a derivative sense to penetrate, as a worm by *gnawing*, or as an auger by a *piercing rotary motion*, gradually *separating* the body entered.

Bur, n. A rough, prickly envelope of seeds; named *bur* in reference to its *boring*, *piercing*, or to its being a *bar*, defence. [See *bore, bar*.]

Far, a. Widely *separate, or separate, emphatically*.

Fare, v., prim., to separate, depart; in a derivative sense, to go, travel, advance, pass.

* The author conceives that to *break, rive or part*, is the primary signification of all words whose root letters are a *labial* and a *lingual*; but for brevity's sake in responding to the query, it is restricted to such words as have the *lingual r*.

Fare, n. Price or equivalent of *passage* : named *fare* by Eliphas.

Fare, n. Food ; primarily, named *fare* as consisting of grain *separated* from chaff, or of meal, which is grain *broken*. [See *farina*, 2nd list.]

Fear, n. The passion which arises from *aversion* to impending danger ; named *fear* for the reason that it impels to *separating*, *departing*, *breaking away*, or *fleeing* from its object.

Fire, n. Combustion, heat, caloric ; named *fire* in reference to its being a *separator*.

Fore, a. Front ; designated by *fore* in reference to the *parting*, *opening*, *breaking* the way ; and hence, *commencing* position, or, to the *advance* position. [See *fare*.]

For, prefix. Opposite, against ; this signification comes from the idea of being in *front*. [See *fore*.]

For, prep. This word is primarily one with *fore*, (which so,) hence, it has the signification of *against*, and from this the import of *instead* ; for that which is *overagainst*, becomes a *match*, an *equivalent*, and hence may *stand in the place* of its mate. *For* denotes, also, aim, purpose, final cause, from the idea of being *overagainst*, as a *match* for the action adjusted to it ; lastly : *for* denotes *cause* or *reason*, whatsoever, by alluding to it as that which is *overagainst*, a match or equal to its effect. [See *par*, *peer*.]

Free, a. Prim. sig. *Separate* ; hence, the customary sig. open, clear, unrestrained, or *separate*, from undue control.

Fair, a. Prim. *Separate* ; hence, in a derivative sense, open, clear, *free* of blemishes.

Four, n. The number which arises from *riving* or *parting* in a customary manner, viz : quartering.

Mar, v. Prim. To *sever* or *break* ; hence, to bruise, wound, injure.

Mere, a. Prim. *Separate* ; hence, bare, alone.

Mere, v. Prim. To *part* or *sever* ; hence, to divide, limit.

Murmur, n. A low sound continually repeated ; named *murmur* in reference to its being a *broken* sound or monotone.

Par, a. Equal. [See *pair*.]

Peer, n. An equal. [See *pair*.]

Pair, n. Two things, matched or equal ; but the idea of *matching*, *coinciding*, arises from that of *meeting*, and this from being *overagainst*, and the idea of being *overagainst*, from that of being in *front*, and this from occupying the *opening*, *commencing*, or *advance* position. [See *fore*, *fare*, *pro*.]

Pare, v. To *separate* the superficial parts, by cutting or shaving.

Pear, n. Fruit of the *Pyrus communis* ; named *pear* in reference to its having the form of a *flame*, *fire*, gr. *pyr.* [See *fire*.]

Pore, n. A minute *opening* or *intersection* ; named *pore* in reference to its being a *breach* or *passage*.

Pure, a. Prim. *Separate* ; hence, clear, free from mixture or defilement. [See *fair*.]

Pur, n. The *broken* musical monotone of a cat.

Pre, Pri, prefixes. Fore, before. These prefixes have the same primary sig. as *for* and *fore*, which see.

Pro, prefix. Fore, forth ; also against. [See *pre*, *pri*, *for*, *fore*.]

Veer, v. To turn, change direction. This sig. is expressed by *veer*, through an allusion to *breaking* from a uniform course. [See *rove*.]

War, v. To quarrel, wrangle ; expressed by the word *war*, through an allusion to *veering*, *whirling*, *writhing*. [See *veer*.]

Wear, v. To waste by attrition, to use, as clothing. The primary sense is to *sever*, *break*, or *riue*.

Weir, n. A dam in a river. The prim. sense is a *break* in regard to the movement of the water.

Reap, Rip, Rive, Rob, verba. The primary sig. is to *separate* in a forcible manner ; hence, their current significations. [The noun *robber*, appears to cover the sig. of *rover* and *river* or *bereaver*. [See *rove*.]

Rove, v. To wander ; prim. to *break* from a uniform course, or to *break* away.

Rave, v. To wander in mind, or act as one who wanders in mind. [See *rove*.]

Rime, n. A chink, fissure ; considered as a *break* of continuity.

Ram, v. To thrust against with violence ; expressed by *ram*, in reference to projecting. [See *rim*.]

Rim, n. Prim. a *break* ; hence, pause, limit, extreme part, or the part which goes about. [See *roam*.]

Roam, v. To *rove*, *wander*, to pursue a *broken* course, moving around about, freely, in opposition to uniform or restricted movement.

Rhyme, n. Numbers, poetry ; named *rhyme*, in reference to its being *parted*, *portioned*, and hence, *measured*, *numbered*.

Second list of Words having for their root letters *r*, and a *lobial*, with one or more of the consonants *prefixed* or *suffixed*.

Break, v. To sever violently, to burst open or forth. *Break* is formed by a coalescence, into one syllable, of the words *bar*, denoting, to *sever*, and *rack* ; sig. prim. to bend, *crook*, and thence, to *strain*, *distort*, *wreck*.— [See *bar*.]

Bark, n. The covering of a tree ; named *bark* in reference to its being a *break*, *bar*, *defence*, or to having a *broken* surface.

Bark, n. The outcry of a dog, considered as an *outbreak*, or as a *bar*, *defence*. [See preceding article.]

Brook, n. A small stream of water, considered as a *break* in the earth's surface, or as a *break* of a larger stream.

Brogue, n. *Broken* speech.

Brash, a. *Brittle*, easily *broken*, *spalt*.

Brass, n. An alloy of copper and zinc ; named *brass* in reference to its being *brittle*, *hasty* to *break*. [The letter *s* is expressive of haste and scattering.]

Brisk, a. Lively, sprightly ; from the idea of *breaking*, or *bursting* forth.

Farina, n. In lat. *Meal* ; *farina* is from the root

fare, to separate or break.

Freak, Freakle, n. A break.

From, prep. Prim. *Fore extreme*; hence, *beginning*. *From* is formed by a coalescence, into one syllable, of the words *fore* and *rim*, which see.

Prime, a. Prim. *Fore extreme*; hence, first in order, original. *Prime* is formed by a coalescence, into one syllable, of the words *pri* and *rim*.

Morn, n. The *break* or first *margin* of day.

River, n. A large stream of water; named *river* in reference to its being a *river* of the earth's surface [See *brook*.]

The mournful event announced in the following "*Tribute of Respect*," to the memory of the late **BARNUM FIELD**, Esq., will be received by the teachers of this State with the same profound grief and emotion that its announcement caused in the immediate vicinity of his sphere of labors.

Mr. F. did not shut up his influence in the city of Boston; while that city was blessed with his untiring labors, the fruits of which were abundant for a long series of years, yet his own State, New England in general, and this and other States shared largely of the same.

With many of the Teachers of this State, he was intimately acquainted and in correspondence. The meetings of our State Association he loved to attend, sympathised with us with all his heart in our educational reforms, partook in our discussions, and gave us his counsel and aid.

His generous spirit and guileless soul we all loved; his good common sense, practical views and orthodox sentiments on all educational subjects were the admiration of all who knew him.

But his work is done; he has entered on his reward, and we doubt not has received the benediction of the *Great Teacher*, "well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou the joy of thy Lord."

With his associates in Boston, and his afflicted family, we do most deeply sympathise, and earnestly pray that this afflictive providence may be over ruled by Him who does not willingly afflict, for their best good, being assured that our loss is his infinite gain.

Tribute of Respect.

BOSTON, May 9, 1851.

At a meeting of the Masters of the Grammar Schools, held at the Bowdoin School, on the 8th inst., the following resolutions, reported by a committee consisting of Messrs. Geo. Allen, Jr., Sam'l Barrett, and Wm. D. Swan, were unanimously adopted.

A. ANDREWS, Ch'n.

HENRY WILLIAMS, Jr. Sec'y.

Resolved, That we have learned with surprise and deep emotion the sudden death of our highly esteemed professional associate, Mr **BARNUM FIELD**, Master of the Franklin School in this city, where, for a quarter of a century, he has labored in the cause of public education with distinguished skill, fidelity and success.

Resolved, That we should be culpably insensible to the virtues of our deceased co-laborer, whose merits we have known so well, did we not cherish in our memories his many estimable and noble qualities as a man, a citizen, a neighbor and a friend; his reliable integrity, his conscientious purpose, his firm friendship, his generous heart and his energetic hand.

Resolved, That in the death of Mr. FIELD not only have we lost an esteemed associate, and his family a devoted husband and father, but the interests of education a discerning and efficient friend, the cause of truth and good morals a firm and fearless advocate, whose generous influence has long been felt far beyond the immediate sphere of his stated labors, or the city in whose employ he so usefully spent most of the years of his vigorous manhood; and that, besides the consolation of his Christian hope, it is a solace, in this bereavement, to feel assured that, not having outlived his usefulness where most known, it will continue even where he has been unknown, spreading its blessings in an ever widening circle, and still accomplishing a good which was the earnest, the constant and the growing desire of his heart.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with the afflicted family of our departed friend, and earnestly commend them to the protection and blessing of Him who is the God of the widow and the Father of the fatherless.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions signed by the Chairman and Secretary, be presented to the family of our late brother, and also offered to the papers of this city for publication.

Agricultural Geology—No. VIII.

BY JOSIAH HOLBROOK.

From the *National Intelligencer*.

Oxygen, calcium, carbon, sulphur, phosphorus, nitrogen, hydrogen, chlorine, and fluorine are *ultimate principles* of matter—simple elements, never yet decomposed or rendered more simple. They all enter into lime formation. Oxygen and calcium are the elements of quick lime. Oxygen and carbon form carbonic acid. The oxyde of calcium, combined with carbonic acid, forms the carbonate of lime—the material of extensive mountain ran-

ges, of limestone in all its varieties of texture, color, and other properties. Coral formations, extending many thousand miles in different parts of the earth, are the carbonate of lime, and used for the ordinary purposes of that mineral. Marbles, existing in several hundred varieties, are also, carbonate of lime.—So is chalk. So are several hundred crystalline forms of this important element of our globe. These crystals, though presented under two or three hundred different shapes, can all be reduced to one shape, shown in rhombic spar, which, if broken into fragments smaller than the head of a pin, presents in every fragment a rhombic or diamond-shaped crystal.

All the carbonates of lime are composed of three simple elements or ultimate principles, viz: oxygen, the great supporter of combustion, carbon, the principal element of coal in all its varieties—whether mineral or vegetable, of course the most important combustible upon our globe; and calcium, a metal, also combustible. The oxygen first exists in two combinations, viz: with carbon and calcium; these two compounds are also combined, of course still more compounded, producing the most abundant carbonate, and one of the most abundant rocks and useful minerals upon our globe.

Next to the carbonates of lime the sulphates are the most abundant and useful of all lime formations. These are also composed of three elements, and the same as in the carbonates, except that sulphur takes the place of the carbon. The oxygen and the sulphur form sulphuric acid; that, combining with the oxygen of calcium, gives the sulphate of lime.—This abundant deposit of lime formations also presents very numerous appearances. All the sulphates of lime, or nearly so, give to the thumb-nail. The carbonates yield to the points of the knife, but not to the thumb-nail. The carbonates effervesce with any strong acid, even vinegar, which effervescence shows what is called life in an eye-stone, which is the mouth-piece of certain shells; all shells being the carbonate of lime. Sulphuric acid has a stronger hold on its various combinations than most other acids, and is hence not displaced either by carbonic, muriatic, or nitric acid. Consequently the sulphate of lime does not, like the carbonate, effervesce with any common acid. The thumb-nail, the point of a knife, and any common acid, are hence sufficient tests, for ordinary purposes, to distinguish the carbonates of lime from sulphates. The sulphate, like the carbonate, appears in many beautiful crystalline forms.

Experiment. By collecting such varieties of these two lime formations as any one can

easily procure, and arranging them upon the mantelpiece, or in a case, a beautiful "CALCAREOUS CABINET" will be formed.—These specimens, tested by each other, by the thumb-nail, the point of a knife, a piece of quartz or glass, any acid, even vinegar, also by the sight, feel, and taste, will furnish much rich instruction and delightful amusement to the possessor. If he has doubts, he will try it of course.

Valuable and Popular Text Books,

PUBLISHED BY

E. H. PEASE & CO.,

ALBANY.

ELEMENTS OF SCIENTIFIC AGRICULTURE, or the Connection between Science and the Art of Practical Farming (Price \$1.00 of the New York State Agricultural Society)—By John F. Norton, M. A., Prof. Scientific Agriculture in Yale College. 12 mo. cloth extra. 30.

"This work is the text-book in the State Normal School, and many important Academies and Schools throughout the United States and in the British Provinces.

Oct. The Regents of the University, at their meeting in October last, adopted the following resolutions:

On motion, *Resolved*, That the study of Agricultural Chemistry be deemed one of the higher branches of English Education, and that it be recognized in the annual distribution of the amount granted to Academies.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Establishment of Common School Department in Academies, of which the Secretary of State is Chairman, be instructed to enquire whether this study shd not be required of all students in said Department.

THE HARMONIA, a New collection of Easy Songs, composed and arranged for one, two, three and four voices, with a new set of Rules and practical Exercises upon an original and scientific plan: for the use of schools, singing classes, and social circles. By Sojourner Cone Teacher of music in the public schools, and Director of Music in the 3d Presbyterian Church, Albany. 38.

PRACTICAL ELOCUTION, containing Illustrations of the Principles of Reading and Public Speaking; also, a selection of the best pieces from ancient and modern authors, accompanied by explanatory notes; the whole adapted to the purpose of improvement in Reading and Oratory. By Samuel Niles Sweet. 1 volume 12mo. 75.

WALKER'S PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY, similar to that formerly published by H. & E. Phinney; good edition. 31. **THE CHILD'S FIRST BOOK OF READING AND DRAWING**. By Jerome E. Howard, Teacher of Drawing in the New York State Normal School. 15.

PRINCIPLES OF AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY and Geol. by James F. W. Johnson, F. R. S., &c., Author of Lectures on Agricultural Chemistry. Edited by John P. Norton, M. A., 1 vol. 12mo., half bound. 25.

ROBINSON'S TREATISE ON ASTRONOMY, Descriptive, Theoretical, and Practical; for schools, academies and private students. By H. N. Robinson, A. M., formerly Professor of Mathematics U. S. N. and author of Robinson's Algebra, Philosophy, &c. &c. 1 vol. 8vo. \$1.00

ROBINSON'S UNIVERSITY ASTRONOMY (containing a Practical Astronomy,) Descriptive, Physical and Practical; designed for colleges and private students. 8vo. \$1.50.

ROBINSON'S ELEMENTARY ALGEBRA, designed as first low one in its science. 63.

ROBINSON'S UNIVERSITY ALGEBRA, 8vo. \$1.00

ROBINSON'S GEOMETRY, PLANE AND SPHERICAL Trigonometry, and Conic Sections. 8 vo. \$1.25.

ROB. N. O. 'S NATURAL PHILO. OPHY. 12mo. 25.

ROBINSON'S ARITHMETIC, 12mo. \$1.00

ALSO JUST PUBLISHED.

MATHEMATICAL RECREATIONS,

CONTAINING

Solutions of many Very Difficult and Important Equations,

And of several useful Problems in Geometry, Surveying and Astronomy.

Together with a Method of Finding Roots of Equations by Projection. By H. M. Robinson, A. M., Author of a Course of Mathematics. 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, \$1.00.

Order from Teachers and others will be executed promptly, and at the LOWEST PRICES for any Books in the market.

E. H. PEASE & CO.,

State-st., Albany